



UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT BRANCH
Washington, D.C. 20570

Via email

March 8, 2022

Re: FOIA Request NLRB-2022-000642

Dear Max Cherney (Protocol Media):

This is in response to your request, under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, received on February 22, 2022, in which you seek all documents in *Intel Corp*, Case Nos. 28-CA-290311 and 19-CA-275943 and *UA Local 469 Plumbers and Pipefitters (Intel)*, Case No. 28-CB-283033. You assumed financial responsibility for the processing of your request in the amount of \$25.00.

We acknowledged your request on February 22, 2022.

Your request is denied in part and granted in part, as explained below.

After conducting searches of the Agency's electronic casehandling system, NxGen, I have determined that certain records responsive to your request for records from *Intel Corp*, Case Nos. 28-CA-290311 and 19-CA-275943 are part of investigative files in open cases before the Agency, and therefore, are exempt from disclosure pursuant to Exemption 7(A) of the FOIA. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(A). Exemption 7(A) allows an agency to withhold records included in an open investigatory file where disclosure could reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings. *See NLRB v. Robbins Tire & Rubber Co.*, 437 U.S. 214, 236 (1978). Therefore, given the open status of these cases, the investigatory records in those case files are being withheld in full at this time pursuant to Exemption 7(A).

Your request is granted to the extent that I have attached the formal records in *Intel Corp*, Case Nos. 28-CA-290311 and 19-CA-275943, which are available to the public pursuant to NLRB FOIA regulations. Redactions were made pursuant to FOIA Exemption 6, which pertains to information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, and FOIA Exemption 7(C), which pertains to records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, the release of which could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6) and (b)(7)(C).

Additionally, a search of the Agency's electronic casehandling system, NxGen, was conducted for records responsive to your request for records from *UA Local 469 Plumbers and Pipefitters (Intel)*, Case No. 28-CB-283033. That search confirmed this case was closed and yielded additional pages of responsive, releasable records from the requested case file, which are also attached. Upon my review of records from *UA Local 469 Plumbers and Pipefitters (Intel)*, Case No. 28-CB-283033, additional redactions were made pursuant to FOIA Exemption 6, which pertains to information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, and FOIA Exemption 7(C), which pertains to records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, the release of which could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. Id.

Finally, five pages of records from *UA Local 469 Plumbers and Pipefitters (Intel)*, Case No. 28-CB-283033 are being withheld in full pursuant to Exemption 5, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(5), including internal Agency communications and case logs.

Exemption 5 allows agencies to withhold "inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency," and covers records that would "normally be privileged in the civil discovery context." *NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 421 U.S. 132, 149 (1975); *Tax Analysts v. IRS*, 117 F.3d 607, 616 (D.C. Cir. 1997). Exemption 5 is designed to protect and promote the objectives of fostering frank deliberation and consultation within an agency and to prevent a premature disclosure that could disrupt and harm the agency's decision-making process. *NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 421 U.S. 132 at 150-152. at 150-152. The deliberative process and the attorney work-product privileges are two of the primary privileges incorporated into Exemption 5.

The deliberative process privilege protects the internal decision-making processes of government agencies to safeguard the quality of agency decisions. *Competitive Enter. Inst. v. OSTP*, 161 F. Supp.3d 120, 128 (D.D.C. 2016). The basis for this privilege is to protect and encourage the creative debate and candid discussion of alternatives. *Jordan v. U.S. Dep't. of Justice*, 591 F.2d 753, 772 (D.C. Cir.1978). Two fundamental requirements must be satisfied before an agency may properly withhold a record pursuant to the deliberative process privilege. First, the record must be predecisional, *i.e.*, prepared in order to assist an agency decision-maker in arriving at the decision. *Renegotiation Bd. v. Grumman Aircraft Eng'g Corp.*, 421 U.S. 168, 184 (1975); *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. FDA*, 449 F.3d 141, 151 (D.C. Cir. 2006). Second, the record must be deliberative, *i.e.*, "it must form a part of the agency's deliberative process in that it makes recommendations or expresses opinions on legal or policy matters." *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. FDA*, 449 F.3d at 151 (quoting *Coastal States Gas Corp. v. U.S. Dep't of Energy*, 617 F.2d 854, 866 (D.C. Cir. 1980)). To satisfy these

requirements, the agency need not “identify a specific decision in connection with which a memorandum is prepared. Agencies are . . . engaged in a continuing process of examining their policies; this process will generate memoranda containing recommendations which do not ripen into agency decisions; and the lower courts should be wary of interfering with this process.” *Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 421 U.S. at 151 n.18 (1975). Moreover, the protected status of a predecisional record is not altered by the subsequent issuance of a decision, *see, e.g., Fed. Open Mkt. Comm. v. Merrill*, 443 U.S. 340, 360 (1979); *Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. v. DHS*, 384 F. Supp. 2d 100, 112-13 (D.D.C. 2005) or by the agency opting not to make a decision. *See Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Clinton*, 880 F. Supp. 1, 13 (D.D.C. 1995), *aff’d*, 76 F.3d 1232 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (citing *Russell v. U.S. Dep’t of the Air Force*, 682 F.2d 1045 (D.C. Cir. 1982)).

The attorney work-product privilege protects records and other memoranda that reveal an attorney’s mental impressions and legal theories that were prepared by an attorney, or a non-attorney supervised by an attorney, in contemplation of litigation. *See United States v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 239 n.13 (1975); *Hickman v. Taylor*, 329 U.S. 495, 509-10 (1947). Additionally, the protection provided by Exemption 5 for attorney work-product records is not subject to defeat even if a requester could show a substantial need for the information and undue hardship in obtaining it from another source. *See FTC v. Grolier, Inc.*, 462 U.S. 19, 28 (1983). Further, protection against the disclosure of work product records extends even after litigation is terminated. *Id.* The attorney work-product privilege extends to records prepared in anticipation of both pending litigation and foreseeable litigation and even when no specific claim is contemplated at the time the attorney prepared the material. *Schiller v. NLRB*, 964 F.2d 1205, 1208 (D.C. Cir. 1992). Furthermore, the privilege protects any part of a record prepared in anticipation of litigation, not just the portions concerning opinions and legal theories, *see Judicial Watch v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 432 F.3d 366, 371 (D.C. Cir. 2005), and is intended to protect an attorney’s opinions, thoughts, impressions, interpretations, analyses and strategies. *Id.*; *see also Wolfson v. United States*, 672 F. Supp.2d 20, 29 (D.D.C. 2009). *See Judicial Watch*, 432 F.3d at 371 (finding that an agency need not segregate and disclose non-exempt material if a record is fully protected as work product).

Here, the responsive records being withheld meet the requirements for Exemption 5 protection under both the deliberative process and attorney work-product privileges. They are internal and predecisional. They reflect the views of the General Counsel and his Regional staff concerning prosecutorial policies and strategies in the processing of this unfair labor practice case. Since they analyze various legal theories and strategies, these internal casehandling records clearly reflect the deliberative and consultative process of the Agency that Exemption 5 protects from forced disclosure. *Sears, Roebuck and Co.*, 421 U.S. at 150-52. Additionally, the content of the records is also attorney work-product, as it reflects legal analysis and opinions of the General Counsel’s staff created to assist

superiors in their decision-making process, in anticipation of possible litigation. Accordingly, the records are being withheld in their entirety.

Please note that Exemption 7(A) protection is “temporal in nature.” *Citizens for Responsibility & Ethics in Wash. v. Dep’t of Justice*, 746 F.3d 1082, 1097 (D.C. Cir 2014) (citing *NLRB v. Robbins Tire*, 437 U.S. 214, 223-24 230-32 (1978)). As such, case file records may become disclosable, subject to applicable exemptions, after the case closes, that is, once a Board decision and/or court order issues, there has been full compliance with a settlement, or the case has otherwise been closed under Agency procedures. Accordingly, you may wish to file a new request at that time.

The status of the two open cases can be tracked on the Agency website at www.nlr.gov by going to the Cases & Decisions tab, clicking case search, entering the case number in the search box and viewing the case pages or by clicking the links here: <https://www.nlr.gov/case/28-CA-290311>; and <https://www.nlr.gov/case/19-CA-275943>, respectively.

For the purpose of assessing fees, we have placed you in Category C, as a representative of the news media, in that you qualify as a person “actively gathering news for an entity that is organized and operated to publish or broadcast news to the public.” NLRB Rules and Regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(d)(1)(vii). Accordingly, there is no charge assessed for this request.

You may contact Joseph Mullaney, the Attorney-Advisor who processed your request, at (202) 273-3863 or by email at Joseph.Mullaney@nlrb.gov, as well as the Agency’s FOIA Public Liaison, for any further assistance and/or to discuss any aspect of your request. The FOIA Public Liaison, in addition to the Attorney-Advisor, can further explain responsive and releasable agency records, suggest agency offices that may have responsive records, and/or discuss how to narrow the scope of a request in order to minimize fees and processing times. The contact information for the FOIA Public Liaison is:

Kristine Minami
FOIA Public Liaison
National Labor Relations Board
1015 Half Street, S.E., 4th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20570
Email: FOIAPublicLiaison@nlrb.gov
Telephone: (202) 273-0902
Fax: (202) 273-FOIA (3642)

After first contacting the Agency, you may additionally contact the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at the National Archives and Records

March 8, 2022

Page 5

Administration to inquire about the FOIA dispute resolution services it offers. The contact information for OGIS is:

Office of Government Information Services
National Archives and Records Administration
8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS
College Park, Maryland 20740-6001
Email: ogis@nara.gov
Telephone: (202) 741-5770
Toll free: (877) 684-6448
Fax: (202) 741-5769

You may obtain a review of this determination under the NLRB Rules and Regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(c)(2)(v), by filing an administrative appeal with the Division of Legal Counsel (DLC) through FOIAonline at: <https://foiaonline.gov/foiaonline/action/public/home> or by mail or email at:

Nancy E. Kessler Platt
Chief FOIA Officer
National Labor Relations Board
1015 Half Street, S.E., 4th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20570
Email: DLCFOIAAppeal@nlrb.gov

Any appeal must be postmarked or electronically submitted within 90 calendar days of the date of this letter. Any appeal should contain a complete statement of the reasons upon which it is based.

Please be advised that contacting any Agency official (including the Attorney-Advisor, FOIA Officer, or the FOIA Public Liaison) and/or OGIS does not stop the 90-day appeal clock and is not an alternative or substitute for filing an administrative appeal.

Sincerely,

/s/ Synta E. Keeling

Synta E. Keeling
FOIA Officer

Attachment: (47 pages)